



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,412	04/21/2004	Timm J. Fenton	A36133 - 072841.0230	5967
21003	7590	11/02/2007	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA 44TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10112-4498			WEAVER, SUE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3781	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/02/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DLNYDOCKET@BAKERBOTTS.COM

FD

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/829,412	FENTON ET AL.	
	Examiner Sue A. Weaver	Art Unit 3781	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Sue A. Weaver. (3) Lisa Chiarini.
 (2) Stephen Kenny. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 05 October 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,15 and 26.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tsai '823 and Lu '459, both of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Sue A. Weaver
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' attorneys requested the interview to derive a better understanding of how the references met the limitations of the independent claims and particularly how the examiner considered the first member to be selectively in communication with the internal volume of the tubular member. The examiner pointed out that there didn't appear to be sufficient structure set forth in the claims to effect this selective communication and therefore it was considered to be no more than a statement of desired result. The examiner suggested the addition of a limitation such as actuation means for actuating the first member to provide such structure. With regard to Tsai the examiner pointed out member 84 as being the joint lock member with members 96 and 110 together defining the first member with the tip of 96 external to member 84 while member 100 was considered to be in selective communication with the interior volume of member 16. With regard to Lu member 12 was indicated as the joint locking member with member 32 as the first member with 321 as shown in figure 2 as the protrusion in communication with the tubular member selectively by removing member 322. Several possibilities were discussed for defining over the references such as making the protrusion in selective communication with the tubular member instead. However that would not appear to distinguish over Lu which is still selective when disassembled or Tsai with regard to member 16 and member 100. The spring in member 20 of Tsai would still remove member 100 from communication with member 16..